APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,270	03/24/2004	Robert R. Blandford	BLANDFORD-01	4085

21261   7590   11/04/2008
ROBERT PLATT BELL
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY
P.O. BOX 13165
Jekyll Island, GA 31527

EXAMINER
WANG, HARRIS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2439	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/807,270	BLANDFORD, ROBERT R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HARRIS C. WANG	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 July 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30-32, 34-48, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 62, 69, 70, 83-85</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,3-17,20,22,24,26,28,30-32,34-48,51,53,55,57,59,61,62,69,70 and 83-85.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant first argues that "The Office Action compares this recitation to applicant's claimed storage on "said remote archive storage means." However lines 26-34 refer, via the flow diagram to the system of Figure 3 which is of the client computer along. hence it is not on a remote computer (Remarks pg. 3)."

At the outset, the Examiner does not see the term "remote computer" in the claimed language. Even if "remote computer" were claimed Figure 3 "illustrates the relationships among a library, an archive, and several notebooks, according to an embodiment of the invention (Column 2, lines 44-46 of Volnak)." It can be argued that the archive is at least remote from other features.

In Page 4-5 of Remarks, the Applicant argues interpretations of the prior art in particular a "delete" function taught in Sykes. The cited portion of Sykes was not cited in the Office action. The Applicants arguments concerning the "delete" function are spurious as such a function is not claimed in Claims 1 and 32.

In Page 6 of Remarks, Applicant argues "With regard to claim 70, the Examiner has taken Official Notice that it is common to verify personal data before providing access." The Examiner stands by this assertion of common knowledge as verifying personal data before providing access is the foundation of authorization.

Furthermore MPEP 2144.03 writes "To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in examiner's actions, which

would include why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." The Applicant has not done so. Because the Official Notice has not been properly traversed, the common knowledge statement is now take to be admitted prior art.

The Applicant then argues "The Examiner then states that the reference show a time-stamping means, but does not cite any portion of either reference which teaches such a feature. Applicant requests that the Examiner cite specifically where within either reference such a feature is taught…The Examiner cannot simply state that a feature is shown in a reference and then leave applicant to guess where it is located. (Remarks pg. 6)."

The Examiner **explicitly writes** (Page 6 of Office Action, **directly underneath the claimed limitation**) in the Office Action "Each entry pane includes…a tag text field, a source text label, a creation time label." A creation time label is a time stamp. The means which creates the label is the time-stamping means.

The Applicant then argues "The problem with this motivation argument is that it merely states a desired end result."

KSR forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness.

The Applicant then argues that that the Examiner's assertion that time-stamping would produce predictable results. The Applicant argues that there time-stamping may produce different results in specific cases (Remarks pg. 7). However the claim language only generically requires "time stamping means coupled to user data processing means

and the remote storage means." The Examiner maintains that the KSR rejection as claimed would yield predictable results, i.e. the time stamping means would produce time stamps, the remote archive would remotely store data and the data processing means would process data the same in combination as it the elements would individually.

The Applicant then argues that "The Examiner is taking the unfounded position that a filing key could comprise a keyword. (pg. 7 Remarks)" The Examiner has explicitly provided support for this interpretation in the Applicants specification. Whether the filing key "are more than keywords" is a spurious argument as the claimed language does not specify one way or another.

Pages 8-10 generally recite the Applicants interpretations of the Prior art and the repeating of previous arguments.

The Applicants arguments are found to be unpersuasive. The Examiner repeats the previous rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10-13, 32, 34, 37-38, 41-44, 69, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Volnak (6694357) in view of Sykes

Regarding Claims 1, 32

Volnak teaches a system for archiving data blocks comprising:

a user data processing means for a user to form one or more data blocks; *("The body of a journal can be created by any suitable technology in the art. For example, text journal entries can be created by a word processing program executed by the computer system" Column 4, lines 41-44)*

transmission means, coupled to the user data processing means, for transmitting said data blocks from the user data processing means; *(Figure 3, shows a transmission of the journal entry to the storage) (Figure 9B shows Figure C over a Wide Area Network)*

and remote archive storage means, coupled to the transmission means, for receiving and storing the one or more data blocks, *(Figure 3, Archives)*

said remote archive storage means preventing anyone, including the user, from modifying or deleting said one or more data blocks stored at said remote archive storage means to provide non-rescindable storage of said data blocks *("Once a journal entry is stored in archives, it becomes "frozen" and can no longer be modified" Column 4, lines 61-62) ("the selected notebooks and the corresponding entries in archives are "published" by replicating the notebooks and the entries storing the resulting copies as a non-modifiable collection of data objects...The published library is referred to as a standalone library and the notebook entries....cannot be modified" Column 5, lines 26-34)*

Volnak does not explicitly teach wherein the user negotiates the initial time period with the remote archive storage means to reach agreement on an initial time period for non-rescindable storage of said one or more data blocks.

Sykes teaches where a user negotiates a time period with an archive storage to reach agreement on a time period. *("The page might contain the option to extend the archiving for one to seven years, providing pick buttons for making the selection, and a place order button for effecting the transaction" Column 7, lines 37-40)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the non-rescindable remote archive system of Volnek, with the ability to negotiate a time period of archive storage as described by Sykes.

The motivation is to provide a way to compensate the storage based on the amount of time of archive storage (Figure 13 of Sykes).

Regarding Claim 3, 34, 69

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1, further comprising: means for retrieving, from the remote archive storage means to the user, a copy of the one or more data blocks. *("Notebook entries can be exported as text files. For example when an export menu command…is selected, the entry shown in the entry plane is stored as a text file in a location specified by the user, Column 8, lines 41-44 of Volnak)*It is inherent that an archive will provide assured access to said means for retrieving data.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Regarding Claim 70,

Volnak and Sykes claim 69. Volnak and Sykes do not explicitly teach wherein said archive requires verified personal data from said user for providing said assured access.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is common to verify personal data before providing access

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the archive require personal data before providing access.

The motivation is to authenticate users before allowing access.

Regarding Claim 6-7, 37-38

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1. Volnak further teaches

secure time-stamping means coupled to the user data processing means and the remote archive storage means for receiving the one or more data blocks, time-stamping the one or more data blocks on receipt, and storing said time-stamp as an additional non-rescindable data block with the one or more data blocks in the remote archive storage means. *("Each entry pane includes...a tag text field, a source text label, a creation time label...Tag text field is the only field that can still be modified after the entry is frozen" Column 7, lines 3, 14-15)*

Volnak does not teach that the time stamping means is physically remote from the user data processing means and the remote archive storage means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Volnak and Sykes to have the time stamping means physically remote from the user data.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (time stamping, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the secure time stamping physically remote with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

The Examiner interprets having time stamping at a physically remote location as the same as having an independent time stamping party.

Regarding Claim 10-13, 41-44

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1. Volnak further teaches:
filing key generating means, coupled to said user data input means and said remote archive storage means, for generating filing keys from said one or more data blocks. search means to search stored filing keys at said remote archive storage means to select at least one of the one or more data blocks for retrieval of copies of the at least one of the one or more data blocks.

("Each entry pane includes…a tag text field… searchable and siftable and are thus referred to as meta-information" Column 7, lines 2, 6-7). The Examiner interprets filing key as "a

compartment name or significant word...useful in retrieving desired data from the archive"

(Applicant's Specification ,Paragraph [0043]).

Volnak and Sykes do not explicitly teach where the filing key generating means

and the search means are physically remote from the data processing means and the

remote archive storage means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Volnak and Sykes to have the filing key generating means and the

search means physically remote from the data processing means and remote archive

means.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (filing key generating

means, searching means, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the filing key physically remote with no

change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded

predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Claims 8-9, 14-15, 31, 39-40, 45-46 , 83-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Volnak in view of Sykes further in view of Cane (5940507).

Regarding Claims 8, 14, 39, 45

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1. Volnak and Sykes however do not explicitly teach: encryption means, coupled to the user data input means and the remote archive storage means, for encrypting the one or more data blocks to create one or more encrypted data blocks, and transmitting said one or more encrypted data blocks to remote archive storage means in place of said one or more data blocks. Botti also does not explicitly teach where encryption means for encrypting the one or more data blocks to produce one or more encrypted data blocks such that the remote archive storage means may not decrypt copies of the one or more encrypted user blocks.

Cane teaches an encryption means *(Figure 1, Cryptographic engine 14)* , coupled to a user *(Figure 1, Source system, 8)* and a remote archive storage *(Figure 1, Archive Server, 30)*, for encrypting the one or more data blocks to create one or more encrypted data blocks *(Figure 1, encrypted file, 20)* and transmitting said one or more encrypted data blocks to remote archive storage *("The encrypted file 20 and encrypted key 24 are then transmitted to the archive server at steps 116 and 118" Column 3, lines 64-66).* Cane further teaches where encryption means for encrypting the one or more data blocks to produce one or more encrypted data blocks such that the remote archive storage means may not decrypt copies of the one or more encrypted user blocks. *("One benefit provided by this arrangement is the elimination of access to data by the archive server, therefore providing the source organization with assurances of access control and privacy,*

while relieving the source organization of archive cataloging and physical storage duties"

Column 2, lines 63-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Botti with the archive encryption system of Cane.

The motivation is to secure the data blocks.

The Above references to not explicitly teach where the user data processing

means and the remote archive storage means are physically remote from the

encrypting means.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (encrypting, remote

archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to have the encryption means physically remote with no change in each of their

respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Regarding Claims 9 ,15, 31 40, 46

Volnak, Sykes and Cane teach the system of claim 8, wherein the encryption

means comprises an encryption party, independent of the user data processing means

and the remote archive storage means, coupled the remote archive storage means via

the transmission means. *("Transmission is electronic via computer network" Column 3, lines 37-38, Cane)*

Volnak, Sykes and Cane do not explicity teach that the encryption means is coupled to the user data processing means via the transmission means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Botti and Cane to have the encryption means independently coupled to the user and the archive using the same transmission means.

The motivation is that one of ordinary skill would be able to connect the user and the encryption means using the same transmission means to provide a channel of communication between elements.

Regarding Claims 83-85,

Volnak, Sykes and Cane teach the systems of Claims 8-9, 14-15.
Cane teaches decryption means, decrypting the encrypted data blocks from the storage to create a decrypted block and transmitting the decrypted block to the user *("Figure 3, "Decrypt encrypted file with secondary key", "Recover original file"))*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cited references above with the citation of Cane that teaches decryption.

The motivation is to decrypt the file.

Volnak, Sykes and Cane do not explicitly teach that the decryption means is
physically remote from the user data process means, and the remote archive means.
The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (decrypting, remote archive,
data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to
have decrypting physically remote with no change in each of their respective functions,
and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in
the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Claims 16-17, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Volnak in view of Sykes further in view of Bijl (6173259).

Regarding Claims 16, 17, 47-48

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1. Volnak and Sykes do not
explicitly teach a:

voice waveform data input means, coupled to said user data processing means,
for receiving a user's voice and creating voice waveform data;

and voice recognition and transcription means, coupled to said user data
processing means and said remote archive storage means, for generating one or more

text data blocks from said voice waveform data transmission for storage in the remote

archive storage means, wherein voice recognition means and transcription means are

independent of the user data processing means and the remote archive storage

means.

Bijl teaches a speech to text system comprising a voice waveform data input

means *("one user terminal for recording speech" Column 2, lines 20-21),* a voice recognition

and transcription means *("at least one automatic speech recognition processor, and*

communication means operative to return the resulting text to a user" Column 2, lines 21-22)

Bijl further teaches that the voice recognition and transcription means are

independent of the user data processing means *("user terminal is remote from at least one*

automatic recognition processor" Column 2, lines 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Volnak and Sykes with a voice recognition and

transcription means.

The Applicant admits (Paragraph [0016] of specification), remote voice

recognition capability already exists in the art, and one of ordinary skill would be able to

combine the well known method of inputting data, via speech to text transcription, to

the data archive system of Volnak. The motivation is to provide another way of

inputting data.

The above references do not explicitly teach that the voice wavefore data input

means is physically remotely located from the user data processing means and the

remote archive.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (voice waveform, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the voice waveform input physically remote with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Claims 4-5, 20, 22, 24, 35-36, 51, 53, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Volnak and Sykes in view of Botti

Regarding Claim 4-5, 20, 22, 24, 35-36, 51, 53, 55

Volnak and Sykes teach the system of claim 1. Volnak and Sykes do not explicitly teach: digital signature generating means, coupled to said user data processing means, for computing for the user, a secure digital signature data block comprising a secure digital signature of the one or more data blocks.

Botti teaches digital signature generating means, coupled to said user data processing means, for computing for the user, a secure digital signature data block comprising a secure digital signature of the one or more data blocks.

("In some embodiments, the digital signature of a file or files is generated locally, and the digital signature is sent without the digital file to a remote server" Paragraph [0014])

Wherein the digital signature generating means would be physically remote from the user data process means and the remote archive storage. *("In other embodiments, the file is sent to a remote server, where both a digital signature and a time stamp are generated" Paragraph [0015])*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Volnak and Sykes to include the digital signature generating means of Botti.

The motivation is to provide security for the data.

However Botti does not explicitly teach appending the digital signature data block to the one or more data blocks.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to append the digital signature to the one or more data blocks.

The motivation is that regardless of whether the signature is attached to the data blocks, the signature is generated performs the same way. Furthermore, Botti teaches "the Authentidate server may maintain a digital copy of the file as submitted in its entirety. The file could be saved in associated with the log of information to be kept on the file such as…the time stamp and the digital signature" (Paragraph [0034]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to append the digital signature to the data block, with predictable results.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Volnak teaches: secure time-stamping means coupled to the user data processing means and the remote archive storage means for receiving the one or more data blocks, time-stamping the one or more data blocks on receipt, and storing said time-stamp as an additional non-rescindable data block with the one or more data blocks in the remote archive storage means. *("Each entry pane includes...a tag text field, a source text label, a creation time label...Tag text field is the only field that can still be modified after the entry is frozen" Column 7, lines 3, 14-15)*

Volnak does not teach that the time stamping means is physically remote from the user data processing means and the remote archive storage means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Botti Volnak and Sykes to have the time stamping means physically remote from the user data.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (time stamping, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the secure time stamping physically remote with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

The Examiner interprets having time stamping at a physically remote location as the same as having an independent time stamping party.

Volnak further teaches:

filing key generating means, coupled to said user data input means and said remote

archive storage means, for generating filing keys from said one or more data blocks.

search means to search stored filing keys at said remote archive storage means to

select at least one of the one or more data blocks for retrieval of copies of the at least

one of the one or more data blocks.

("Each entry pane includes…a tag text field… searchable and siftable and are thus referred to

as meta-information" Column 7, lines 2, 6-7). The Examiner interprets filing key as "a

compartment name or significant word…useful in retrieving desired data from the archive"

(Applicant's Specification ,Paragraph [0043]).

Botti Volnak and Sykes do not explicitly teach where the filing key generating

means and the search means are physically remote from the data processing means

and the remote archive storage means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Botti Volnak and Sykes to have the filing key generating means and

the search means physically remote from the data processing means and remote

archive means.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (filing key generating

means, searching means, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the secure filing key physically remote

with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have

yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Claims 26, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Volnak, Sykes, Bottie as applied to claims 24, 55 above, and further in view of Bijl.

Regarding Claims 26, 57

The cited references teach claims 24, 55, but do not explicitly disclose do not explicitly

teach a voice waveform data input means, coupled to said user data processing

means, for receiving a user's voice and creating voice waveform data; and voice

recognition and transcription means, coupled to said user data processing means and

said remote archive storage means, for generating one or more text data blocks from

said voice waveform data transmission for storage in the remote archive storage

means.

Bijl teaches a speech to text system comprising a voice waveform data input

means *("one user terminal for recording speech" Column 2, lines 20-21),* a voice recognition

and transcription means *("at least one automatic speech recognition processor, and*

communication means operative to return the resulting text to a user" Column 2, lines 21-22)

Bijl further teaches that the voice recognition and transcription means are

independent of the user data processing means *("user terminal is remote from at least one*

automatic recognition processor" Column 2, lines 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the above claims with a voice recognition and transcription means.

As the Applicant admits (Paragraph [0016] of specification), remote voice

recognition capability already exists in the art, and one of ordinary skill would be able to

combine the well known method of inputting data, via speech to text transcription, to

the data archive system of Botti. The motivation would be to provide another way of

inputting data.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the voice waveform physically remote

with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have

yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Claims 28, 30, 59, 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Volnak. Sykes, Botti, Bijl as applied to claims 26-57 above, and

further in view of Cane.

Regarding Claims 28-30, 59, 61-62

The cited references teach claims 26, 57, but do not explicitly disclose do not explicitly

teach: encryption means, coupled to the user data input means and the remote archive

storage means, for encrypting the one or more data blocks to create one or more

encrypted data blocks, and transmitting said one or more encrypted data blocks to

remote archive storage means in place of said one or more data blocks. Botti also does

not explicitly teach where encryption means for encrypting the one or more data blocks
to produce one or more encrypted data blocks such that the remote archive storage
means may not decrypt copies of the one or more encrypted user blocks.

Cane teaches an encryption means *(Figure 1, Cryptographic engine 14)* , coupled to
a user *(Figure 1, Source system, 8)* and a remote archive storage *(Figure 1, Archive
Server, 30)*, for encrypting the one or more data blocks to create one or more encrypted
data blocks *(Figure 1, encrypted file, 20)* and transmitting said one or more encrypted
data blocks to remote archive storage *("The encrypted file 20 and encrypted key 24 are
then transmitted to the archive server at steps 116 and 118" Column 3, lines 64-66).*   Cane
further teaches where encryption means for encrypting the one or more data blocks to
produce one or more encrypted data blocks such that the remote archive storage
means may not decrypt copies of the one or more encrypted user blocks. *("One benefit
provided by this arrangement is the elimination of access to data by the archive server,
therefore providing the source organization with assurances of access control and privacy,
while relieving the source organization of archive cataloging and physical storage duties"
Column 2, lines 63-67)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify the system of Botti with the archive encryption system of Cane.

The motivation is to secure the data blocks.

The Above references to not explicitly teach where the user data processing
means and the remote archive storage means are physically remote from the
encrypting means.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (encrypting, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the encryption means physically remote to the system with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Cane teaches decryption means, decrypting the encrypted data blocks from the storage to create a decrypted block and transmitting the decrypted block to the user *("Figure 3, "Decrypt encrypted file with secondary key", "Recover original file"))*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the cited references above with the citation of Cane that teaches decryption.

The motivation is to decrypt the file.

The parts of the references cited above do not explicitly teach that the decryption means is physically remote from the user data process means, and the remote archive means.

The references cited contain all the limitations of the claim (decrypting, remote archive, data processing means) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have decrypting physically remote to the system with no change in each of their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited portions teach the method associated with the system.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HARRIS C. WANG whose telephone number is

(571)270-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, KAMBIZ ZAND can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harris C Wang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

      /Kambiz Zand/

      Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434